arXiv:1406.7479v1 [math.FA] 29 Jun 2014

Energy estimates and symmetry breaking in attractive Bose-Einstein condensates with ring-shaped potentials

Yujin Guo, Xiaoyu Zeng & Huan-Song Zhou

Abstract

This paper is concerned with the properties of L^2-normalized minimizers of the Gross-Pitaevskii (GP) functional for a two-dimensional Bose-Einstein condensate with attractive interaction and ring-shaped potential. By establishing some delicate estimates on the least energy of the GP functional, we prove that symmetry breaking occurs for the minimizers of the GP functional as the interaction strength $a > 0$ approaches a critical value a^*, each minimizer of the GP functional concentrates to a point on the circular bottom of the potential well and then is non-radially symmetric as $a \nearrow a^*$. However, when $a > 0$ is suitably small we prove that the minimizers of the GP functional are unique, and this unique minimizer is radially symmetric.

Keywords: Bose-Einstein condensate; attractive interactions; Gross-Pitaevskii functional; ring-shaped potential; symmetry breaking.
MSC: 35J60, 35Q40,46N50.

1 Introduction

Since the remarkable experiments on Bose-Einstein condensates (BEC) in dilute gases of alkali atoms in 1995 [1, 6], much attention has been attracted to the experimental studies on BEC over the last two decades, and many new phenomena of BEC have been observed in experiments [6]. These new experimental progresses also inspired the theoretical research in BEC, especially, the theory of Gross-Pitaevskii (GP) equations proposed by Gross and Pitaevskii [10, 11, 27]. There has been a growing interest in the mathematical theories and numerical methods of GP equations [2]. Several rigorous mathematical verifications of GP theory were established, see e.g. [8, 20, 21, 22, 23]. It is known that the classical trapping potential used in the study of BEC is the harmonic potential. With the advance of experimental techniques for BEC, some different trapping potentials have been used in the experiments [4, 13, 15, 29, 30]. Theoretically, it is also interesting to discuss mathematically how the shapes of trapping potentials affect the behavior of BEC. Very recently, Guo and Seiringer [12] studied the BEC with attractive

interactions in $\mathbb{R}^2$ described by the following GP functional

$$E_a(u) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \big(|\nabla u(x)|^2 + V(x)|u(x)|^2\big)dx - \frac{a}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u(x)|^4 dx\,, \quad u \in \mathcal{H}\,, \tag{1.1}$$

where $a > 0$ describes the strength of the attractive interactions, and

$$\mathcal{H} := \Big\{u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) : \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x)|u(x)|^2 dx < \infty\Big\}, \tag{1.2}$$

with a trapping potential of the form

$$V(x) = h(x)\prod_{i=1}^{n} |x - x_i|^{p_i}, \quad p_i > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad C < h(x) < 1/C \tag{1.3}$$

for some $C > 0$ and all $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. The authors in [2, 12] proved that there exists $a^* > 0$ such that the constrained minimization problem

$$e(a) := \inf\Big\{E_a(u) : u \in \mathcal{H} \text{ and } \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u^2 dx = 1\Big\} \tag{1.4}$$

has at least one minimizer if and only if $a \in [0, a^*)$. Moreover,

$$a^* = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |Q(x)|^2 dx, \tag{1.5}$$

and $Q(x)$ is the unique positive solution (up to translations) of the scalar field equation

$$-\Delta u + u - u^3 = 0 \ \text{ in } \ \mathbb{R}^2, \ \ u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2). \tag{1.6}$$

The existence of $Q(x)$ is well known and $Q(x)$ is actually radially symmetric, see e.g. [9, 17, 18, 25].

In what follows, we call $e(a)$ the GP energy, which is also the least energy of a BEC system. As mentioned in [12], the parameter a in (1.1) has to be interpreted as the particle number times the interaction strength, the existence of the threshold value a^* described above shows that there exists a critical particle number for collapse of the BEC [6]. Theorem 1 of [12] implies that the shape of trapping potential does not affect the critical particle number. However, the behavior of the minimizers for (1.4) as $a \nearrow a^*$ does depend on the shape of potentials. In fact, for the trapping potential (1.3), a detailed description of the behavior of the minimizers for (1.4) is given in Theorem 2 of [12], which shows that minimizers of (1.4) must concentrate at one of the flattest minima $x_{i_0} (1 \le i \le n)$ of $V(x)$ as $a \nearrow a^*$. This also implies the presence of symmetry breaking of the minimizer. Note that the method of [12] depends heavily on the potential $V(x)$ of (1.3) having a finite number of minima $\{x_i \in \mathbb{R}^2,\ i = 1, \cdots, n\}$.

It is natural to ask what would happen if $V(x)$ has infinitely many minima. Hence, in this paper we are mainly interested in studying the GP functional with a trapping potential $V(x)$ with infinitely many minima and analyzing the detailed behavior of its

minimizers as $a \nearrow a^*$. For this purpose, we focus on the following ring-shaped trapping potential:

$$V(x) = (|x| - A)^2, \quad \text{where } A > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^2, \tag{1.7}$$

which is essentially an important potential used in BEC experiments, see e.g. [14, 15, 29]. Clearly, all points in the set $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x| = A\}$ are minima of the potential given by (1.7). Concerning the existence of minimizers of problem (1.4), much more general potentials $V(x)$ than (1.7) are allowed, see [12, Theorem 1]. But to demonstrate clearly that symmetry breaking does occur in the minimizers of problem (1.4), the uniqueness of the minimizers of problem (1.4) is used in our Corollary 1.4. So, we give first the theorem as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let a^* be given by (1.5), and let $V(x)$ be such that*

$$0 \le V(x) \in L^\infty_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^2)\,, \quad \lim_{|x|\to\infty} V(x) = \infty \quad \textit{and} \quad \inf_{x\in\mathbb{R}^2} V(x) = 0\,.$$

Then

(i) *For all $a \in [0, a^*)$ (1.4) has at least one minimizer, and there is no minimizer for (1.4) if $a \ge a^*$. Moreover, $e(a) > 0$ if $a < a^*$, $\lim_{a\nearrow a^*} e(a) = e(a^*) = 0$ and $e(a) = -\infty$ if $a > a^*$.*

(ii) *When $a \in [0, a^*)$ is suitably small, (1.4) has a unique non-negative minimizer in $\mathcal{H}$.*

Part (i) of the above theorem is just Theorem 1 of [12]. For part (ii), a proof based on an implicit function theorem is given in the Appendix.

To analyze the detailed behavior of the minimizers for problem (1.4), a delicate estimate on the GP functional is required. As far as we know, it is usually not easy to derive directly the optimal energy estimates for the GP functional (1.1) under general trapping potentials. Although the authors in [12] developed an approach to establish this kind of energy estimates for the potential (1.3), it does not work well for our potential (1.7). In fact, by following the method of [12] we are only able to get the following type of estimates

$$C_1(a^* - a)^{\frac{2}{3}} < e(a) < C_2(a^* - a)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{as} \quad a \nearrow a^*, \tag{1.8}$$

see our Lemma 2.1 for the details. Therefore, one of the aims of the paper is to provide some new ways to estimate precisely the GP energy under the potential (1.7), which may be used effectively to handle some general type potentials. Based on the estimates, we may improve the power $\frac{2}{3}$ at the left of (1.8) to be the same as at the right, namely $\frac{1}{2}$. That is, we have

Theorem 1.2. *Let $V(x)$ be given by (1.7). Then, there exist two positive constants C_1 and C_2, independent of a, such that*

$$C_1(a^* - a)^{\frac{1}{2}} < e(a) < C_2(a^* - a)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \textit{as} \quad a \nearrow a^*. \tag{1.9}$$

With the estimates of (1.9), we may continue to analyze in detail the behavior of the minimizers of (1.4) and we finally have the following theorem.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $V(x)$ be given by (1.7) and let u_a be a non-negative minimizer of (1.4) for $a < a^*$. Given a sequence $\{a_k\}$ with $a_k \nearrow a^*$ as $k \to \infty$, there exists a subsequence, still denoted by $\{a_k\}$, such that each u_{a_k} has a unique maximum point x_k and $x_k \to y_0$ as $k \to \infty$ for some $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ satisfying $|y_0| = A > 0$. Moreover,*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{|x_k| - A}{(a^* - a_k)^{\frac{1}{4}}} = 0\,, \tag{1.10}$$

and

$$(a^* - a_k)^{\frac{1}{4}} u_{a_k}\left(x_k + x(a^* - a_k)^{\frac{1}{4}}\right) \xrightarrow{k} \frac{\lambda_0 Q(\lambda_0 x)}{\|Q\|_2} \text{ strongly in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^2), \tag{1.11}$$

where $\lambda_0 > 0$ satisfies

$$\lambda_0 = \Big(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |y_0 \cdot x|^2 Q^2(x)dx}{A^2}\Big)^{\frac{1}{4}}. \tag{1.12}$$

As we mentioned before, the method used in [12] cannot be applied directly in our case because the potential $V(x)$ in (1.7) has infinitely many global minima and some new difficulties must be overcome in proving Theorem 1.3. Also, finding the exact value of λ_0 in Theorem 1.3 is more involved. Noting that the trapping potential $V(x)$ of (1.7) is radially symmetric, it then follows from Theorem 1.1 (ii) that $e(a)$ has a unique non-negative minimizer which is also radially symmetric for small $a > 0$. On the other hand, Theorem 1.3 shows that any non-negative minimizer of $e(a)$ concentrates at a point on the ring $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x| = A\}$ as $a \nearrow a^*$, and thus it cannot be radially symmetric. This implies that, as the strength of the interaction a increases from 0 to a^*, symmetry breaking occurs in the minimizers of $e(a)$. So we have the following corollary.

Corollary 1.4. *Let $V(x)$ be given by (1.7). Then there exist $a_* > 0$ and $a_{**} > 0$ satisfying $a_{**} \le a_* < a^*$ such that*

(i) *$e(a)$ has a unique non-negative minimizer which is radially symmetric about the origin if $a \in [0, a_{**})$.*

(ii) *$e(a)$ has infinitely many different non-negative minimizers, which are not radially symmetric if $a \in [a_*, a^*)$.*

We end this section by recalling some useful information related to the unique positive solution $Q(x)$ of (1.6). Take $N = 2$ in (I.2) of [33], we then have the following Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u(x)|^4 dx \le \frac{2}{a^*} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u(x)|^2 dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u(x)|^2 dx, \quad u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)\,, \tag{1.13}$$

and "=" holds when $u(x) = Q(x)$, where $a^* = \|Q\|_2^2$. Since $Q(x)$ is a solution of (1.6), it is easy to see that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla Q|^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |Q|^2 dx = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |Q|^4 dx, \tag{1.14}$$

see also [3, Lemma 8.1.2] for the details. Furthermore, by the results of [9, Propositon 4.1], we know that

$$Q(x)\,,\ |\nabla Q(x)| = O(|x|^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-|x|}) \quad \text{as } |x| \to \infty. \tag{1.15}$$

Throughout the paper, we denote the norm of $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ by $\|\cdot\|_p$ for $p \in (1, +\infty)$, and define the norms of $\mathcal{H}$ and $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ by

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \big(|\nabla u|^2 + V(x)|u|^2\big) dx \quad \text{for } u \in \mathcal{H},$$

and

$$\|u\|^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \big(|\nabla u|^2 + |u|^2\big) dx \quad \text{for } u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2), \text{ respectively.}$$

The scalar product of $\mathcal{H}$ is given by

$$\langle u, v\rangle_{\mathcal{H},\mathcal{H}} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla u \nabla v + V(x)uv dx \quad \text{for } u, v \in \mathcal{H}\,.$$

This paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we first establish some preparatory energy estimates and then prove Theorem 1.2, that is, the refined estimates for the energy $e(a)$ are obtained. Theorem 1.3 is proved in Section 3, where the phenomena of concentration and symmetry breaking of the minimizers of (1.4) are also discussed. Finally, by using an implicit function theorem, Theorem 1.1 (ii) is proved in the Appendix.

2 Energy estimates: Proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section, by using some ideas of [12], we establish first a rough estimate like (1.8) for the energy $e(a)$ of (1.4). Based on this estimate, some detailed properties of the minimizers of $e(a)$ can be obtained. With these we can prove Theorem 1.2, which gives an optimal energy estimate for $e(a)$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $V(x)$ be given by (1.7). Then, there exist two positive constants C_1 and C_2, independent of a, such that*

$$C_1(a^* - a)^{\frac{2}{3}} \le e(a) \le C_2(a^* - a)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \textit{as} \quad a \nearrow a^*. \tag{2.1}$$

Proof. For any $\lambda > 0$ and $u \in \mathcal{H}$ with $\|u\|_2^2 = 1$, using (1.13),

$$\begin{aligned} E_a(u) &\ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (|x| - A)^2 |u(x)|^2 dx + \frac{a^* - a}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u(x)|^4 dx \\ &= \lambda + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Big[(|x| - A)^2 - \lambda\Big] |u(x)|^2 dx + \frac{a^* - a}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u(x)|^4 dx \\ &\ge \lambda - \frac{1}{2(a^* - a)}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \big[\lambda - (|x| - A)^2\big]_+^2 dx, \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

where $A > 0$ and $[\,\cdot\,]_+ = \max\{0, \cdot\}$ denotes the positive part. For $\lambda > 0$ small enough, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left[\lambda - (|x| - A)^2\right]_+^2 dx &= 2\pi \int_{A-\sqrt{\lambda}}^{A+\sqrt{\lambda}} [\lambda - (r-A)^2]^2 r dr \\ &= 2\pi\lambda^2 \int_{-\frac{\pi}{2}}^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \cos^4\beta (A + \sqrt{\lambda}\sin\beta)\sqrt{\lambda}\cos\beta d\beta \le C\lambda^{\frac{5}{2}},\end{aligned}$$

where we change the variable $r = A + \sqrt{\lambda}\sin\beta$ with $-\frac{\pi}{2} \le \beta \le \frac{\pi}{2}$ in the second identity. The lower estimate of (2.1) therefore follows from the above estimate and (2.2) by taking $\lambda = [4(a^* - a)/(5C)]^{2/3}$ and $a \nearrow a^*$.

We next prove the upper estimate of (2.1) as follows. Choose a non-negative $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that $\varphi(x) = 1$ for $|x| \le 1$. For any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ satisfying $|x_0| = A > 0$, $\tau > 0$ and $R > 0$, set

$$u(x) = A_{R,\tau} \frac{\tau}{\|Q\|_2} \varphi((x - x_0)/R) Q(\tau(x - x_0)), \tag{2.3}$$

where $A_{R,\tau} > 0$ is chosen so that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u^2(x)dx = 1$. By scaling, $A_{R,\tau}$ depends only on the product $R\tau$, and we have $\lim_{R\to\infty} A_{R,\tau} = 1$. In fact,

$$\frac{1}{A_{R,\tau}^2} = \frac{1}{\|Q\|_2^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} Q(x)^2 \varphi(x/(\tau R))^2 dx = 1 + o((R\tau)^{-\infty}) \quad \text{as } R\tau \to \infty, \tag{2.4}$$

because of the exponential decay of Q in (1.15). Here we use the notation $f(t) = o(t^{-\infty})$ for a function f satisfying $\lim_{t\to\infty} |f(t)|t^s = 0$ for all $s > 0$.

By the exponential decay of (1.15), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u(x)|^2 dx - \frac{a}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u^4(x)dx \\ &= \frac{\tau^2}{\|Q\|_2^2}\Big[\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla Q(x)|^2 dx - \frac{a}{2\|Q\|_2^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} Q^4(x)dx + o((R\tau)^{-\infty})\Big] \\ &= \frac{\tau^2}{2\|Q\|_2^2}\Big[\Big(1 - \frac{a}{\|Q\|_2^2}\Big)\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} Q^4(x)dx + o((R\tau)^{-\infty})\Big] \quad \text{as} \quad R\tau \to \infty,\end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

where (1.14) is used. On the other hand, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (|x| - A)^2 |u|^2 dx &\le \frac{1}{a^*}\int_{B_{R\tau}(0)} (|\frac{x}{\tau} + x_0| - |x_0|)^2 Q^2(x)dx + o((R\tau)^{-\infty}) \\ &\le C\int_{B_{R\tau}(0)} |\frac{x}{\tau}|^2 Q^2(x)dx + o((R\tau)^{-\infty}) \\ &\le \frac{C}{\tau^2} + o((R\tau)^{-\infty}) \quad \text{as} \quad R\tau \to \infty.\end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

It then follows from (2.5) and (2.6) that

$$e(a) \le C(a^* - a)\tau^2 + \frac{C}{\tau^2} + o((R\tau)^{-\infty}) \quad \text{as} \quad R\tau \to \infty.$$

By taking $\tau = (a^* - a)^{-\frac{1}{4}}$, the above inequality implies the desired upper estimate of (2.1). □

By Lemma 2.1 and using a similar procedures as the proof of Lemma 4 of [12], the following estimates for minimizers of $e(a)$ can be obtained. Here we omit the proof of the lemma.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $V(x)$ be given by (1.7) and suppose u_a is a non-negative minimizer of (1.4), then there exists a positive constant K, independent of a, such that*

$$0 < K(a^* - a)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_a|^4 dx \leq \frac{1}{K}(a^* - a)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{as} \quad a \nearrow a^*. \quad \square \tag{2.7}$$

Lemma 2.3. *For $V(x)$ satisfying (1.7), let u_a be a non-negative minimizer of (1.4), and set*

$$\epsilon_a^{-2} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_a(x)|^2 dx. \tag{2.8}$$

Then

(i) *$\epsilon_a \to 0$ as $a \nearrow a^*$.*

(ii) *There exist a sequence $\{y_{\epsilon_a}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and positive constants R_0, η such that the sequence*

$$w_a(x) := \epsilon_a u_a(\epsilon_a x + \epsilon_a y_{\epsilon_a}) \tag{2.9}$$

satisfies

$$\liminf_{\epsilon_a \to 0} \int_{B_{R_0}(0)} |w_a|^2 dx \geq \eta > 0. \tag{2.10}$$

(iii) *The sequence $\{\epsilon_a y_{\epsilon_a}\}$ is bounded uniformly for $\epsilon_a \to 0$. Moreover, for any sequence $\{a_k\}$ with $a_k \nearrow a^*$, there exists a convergent subsequence, still denoted by $\{a_k\}$, such that*

$$\bar{x}_k := \epsilon_{a_k} y_{\epsilon_{a_k}} \to x_0 \quad \text{as } a_k \nearrow a^* \tag{2.11}$$

for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ being a global minimum point of $V(x)$, i.e., $|x_0| = A > 0$. Furthermore, we also have

$$w_{a_k} \xrightarrow{k} \frac{\beta_1}{\|Q\|_2} Q(\beta_1 |x - y_0|) \text{ in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \text{ for some } y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ and } \beta_1 > 0. \tag{2.12}$$

Proof. (i): Applying (1.13), it follows from Lemma 2.1 that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x)|u_a(x)|^2 dx \leq e(a) \leq C_1(a^* - a)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{as} \quad a \nearrow a^*, \tag{2.13}$$

and

$$0 \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_a(x)|^2 dx - \frac{a}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_a(x)|^4 dx = \epsilon_a^{-2} - \frac{a}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_a(x)|^4 dx \leq e(a) \xrightarrow{a \nearrow a^*} 0.$$

Then, by Lemma 2.2, there exists a constant $m > 0$, independent of a, such that

$$0 < m\epsilon_a^{-2} \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_a(x)|^4 dx \le \frac{1}{m}\epsilon_a^{-2} \quad \text{as} \quad a \nearrow a^*, \tag{2.14}$$

and

$$C_2(a^* - a)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_a(x)|^2 dx \le C_3(a^* - a)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{as} \quad a \nearrow a^*. \tag{2.15}$$

Hence, $\epsilon_a \to 0$ as $a \nearrow a^*$, and (i) is proved.

(ii): Let

$$\tilde{w}_a(x) := \epsilon_a u_a\big(\epsilon_a x\big). \tag{2.16}$$

From (2.8) and (2.14), we see that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \tilde{w}_a|^2 dx = 1, \quad m \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\tilde{w}_a|^4 dx \le \frac{1}{m}. \tag{2.17}$$

We claim that

$$\liminf_{\epsilon_a \to 0} \int_{B_{R_0}(y_{\epsilon_a})} |\tilde{w}_a|^2 dx \ge \eta > 0. \tag{2.18}$$

On the contrary, suppose (2.18) is false. Then for any $R > 0$, there exists a sequence $\{\tilde{w}_{a_k}\}$ with $a_k \nearrow a^*$ such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}^2} \int_{B_R(y)} |\tilde{w}_{a_k}|^2 dx = 0.$$

By Lemma I.1 in [24] or Theorem 8.10 in [19], we then deduce that $\tilde{w}_{a_k} \xrightarrow{k} 0$ in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for any $2 < p < \infty$, which contradicts (2.17). Thus (2.18) holds, and then (2.10) follows from (2.16) and (2.18).

(iii): By (2.13), we see that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x)|u_a(x)|^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(\epsilon_a x + \epsilon_a y_{\epsilon_a})|w_a(x)|^2 dx \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad a \nearrow a^*. \tag{2.19}$$

Suppose $\{\epsilon_a y_{\epsilon_a}\}$ is unbounded as $\epsilon_a \to 0$. Then there exists a subsequence $\{a_n\}$, where $a_n \nearrow a^*$ as $n \to \infty$, such that

$$\epsilon_n := \epsilon_{a_n} \to 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon_n y_{\epsilon_n} \longrightarrow \infty \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty.$$

Since $V(x) \to \infty$ as $|x| \to \infty$, we derive from (2.10) and Fatou's Lemma that for any $C > 0$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(\epsilon_n x + \epsilon_n y_{\epsilon_n})|w_{a_n}(x)|^2 dx \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \lim_{n\to\infty} V(\epsilon_n x + \epsilon_n y_{\epsilon_n})|w_{a_n}(x)|^2 dx \ge C\eta > 0,$$

which contradicts (2.19). Thus, $\{\epsilon_a y_{\epsilon_a}\}$ is bounded uniformly for $\epsilon_a \to 0$. Therefore, for any sequence $\{a_k\}$ there exists a convergent subsequence, still denoted by $\{a_k\}$, such that

$$\bar{x}_k := \epsilon_k y_{\epsilon_k} \xrightarrow{k} x_0 \text{ for some point } x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2, \text{ where } \epsilon_k := \epsilon_{a_k}.$$

We claim that $|x_0| = A$. Otherwise, if $|x_0| \neq A$, then $V(x_0) > 0$. By applying Fatou's Lemma again, we deduce from (2.10) that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(\epsilon_k x + \epsilon_k y_{\epsilon_k})|w_{a_k}(x)|^2 dx \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \lim_{k\to\infty} V(\epsilon_k x + \epsilon_k y_{\epsilon_k})|w_a(x)|^2 dx \geq \frac{\eta}{2} V(x_0) > 0,$$

which contradicts (2.19). So, $|x_0| = A > 0$, and (2.11) is proved.

We now turn to proving (2.12). Since u_a is a non-negative minimizer of (1.4), it satisfies the Euler-Lagrange equation

$$-\Delta u_a(x) + V(x)u_a(x) = \mu_a u_a(x) + a u_a^3(x) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2, \tag{2.20}$$

where $\mu_a \in \mathbb{R}$ is a Lagrange multiplier, and

$$\mu_a = e(a) - \frac{a}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_a|^4 dx.$$

It then follows from Lemma 2.1 and (2.14) that there exist two positive constants C_1 and C_2, independent of a, such that

$$-C_2 < \epsilon_a^2 \mu_a < -C_1 < 0 \quad \text{as} \quad a \nearrow a^*.$$

In view of (2.20), $w_a(x)$ defined in (2.9) satisfies the elliptic equation

$$-\Delta w_a(x) + \epsilon_a^2 V(\epsilon_a x + \epsilon_a y_{\epsilon_a}) w_a(x) = \epsilon_a^2 \mu_a w_a(x) + a w_a^3(x) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{2.21}$$

Therefore, for the convergent subsequence $\{a_k\}$ obtained in (2.11), we may assume that $\epsilon_k^2 \mu_{a_k} \xrightarrow{k} -\beta_1^2 < 0$ for some $\beta_1 > 0$, and $w_{a_k} \overset{k}{\rightharpoonup} w_0 \geq 0$ weakly in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for some $w_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Since $\{\epsilon_a y_{\epsilon_a}\}$ is bounded uniformly in ϵ_a, by passing to the weak limit of (2.21), we see that $w_0 \geq 0$ satisfies

$$-\Delta w_0(x) = -\beta_1^2 w_0(x) + a^* w_0^3(x) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{2.22}$$

Furthermore, it follows from (2.10) that $w_0 \not\equiv 0$, and therefore we have $w_0 > 0$ by the strong maximum principle. By a simple rescaling, the uniqueness (up to translations) of positive solutions for the nonlinear scalar field equation (1.6) implies that

$$w_0(x) = \frac{\beta_1}{\|Q\|_2} Q(\beta_1 |x - y_0|) \quad \text{for some} \quad y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2, \tag{2.23}$$

where $||w_0||_2^2 = 1$. By the norm preservation we further conclude that w_{a_k} converges to w_0 strongly in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and in fact, strongly in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for any $2 \leq p < \infty$ because of $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ boundedness. Also, since w_{a_k} and w_0 satisfy (2.21) and (2.22), respectively, a simple analysis shows that w_{a_k} converges to w_0 strongly in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and thus (2.12) holds. □

Lemma 2.4. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 2.3, let $\{a_k\}$ be the convergent subsequence given by Lemma 2.3 (ii). Then, for any $R > 0$, there exists $C_0(R) > 0$, independent of a_k, such that*

$$\lim_{\epsilon_{a_k}\to 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon_{a_k}^2} \int_{B_R(0)} V(\epsilon_{a_k} x + \epsilon_{a_k} y_{\epsilon_{a_k}}) |w_{a_k}(x)|^2 dx \geq C_0(R). \tag{2.24}$$

Proof. Since $V(x) = (|x| - A)^2$ with $A > 0$, we have

$$V(\epsilon_a x + \epsilon_a y_{\epsilon_a}) = \epsilon_a^2 \Big(|x + y_{\epsilon_a}| - \frac{A}{\epsilon_a} \Big)^2, \tag{2.25}$$

where the term $|x + y_{\epsilon_a}|$ can be rewritten as

$$|x + y_{\epsilon_a}| = \sqrt{|x|^2 + |y_{\epsilon_a}|^2} \sqrt{1 + \frac{2x \cdot y_{\epsilon_a}}{|x|^2 + |y_{\epsilon_a}|^2}}. \tag{2.26}$$

For the convergent sequence $\{a_k\}$ given by Lemma 2.3 (ii), since $\epsilon_k y_{\epsilon_k} \xrightarrow{k} x_0$ with $|x_0| = A > 0$, we have $|y_{\epsilon_k}| \xrightarrow{k} \infty$, and hence $\frac{2x \cdot y_{\epsilon_k}}{|x|^2 + |y_{\epsilon_k}|^2} \xrightarrow{k} 0$ uniformly for $x \in B_R(0)$. Using the Taylor expansion we obtain that

$$\sqrt{1 + \frac{2x \cdot y_{\epsilon_k}}{|x|^2 + |y_{\epsilon_k}|^2}} = 1 + \frac{x \cdot y_{\epsilon_k}}{|x|^2 + |y_{\epsilon_k}|^2} + O\big(\frac{1}{|y_{\epsilon_k}|^2}\big) \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in B_R(0),$$

which, together with (2.25) and (2.26), then implies that

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon_k^2} V(\epsilon_k x + \epsilon_k y_{\epsilon_k}) = \Big| \sqrt{|x|^2 + |y_{\epsilon_k}|^2} + \frac{x \cdot y_{\epsilon_k}}{\sqrt{|x|^2 + |y_{\epsilon_k}|^2}} - \frac{A}{\epsilon_k} + O\big(\frac{1}{|y_{\epsilon_k}|}\big) \Big|^2. \tag{2.27}$$

For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, let *arg* x be the angle between x and the positive x-axis, and $\langle x, y \rangle$ the angle between the vectors x and y. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $x_0 = (A, 0)$, and it then follows that $\arg y_{\epsilon_k} \xrightarrow{k} 0$. Thus, we can choose $0 < \delta < \frac{\pi}{16}$ small enough such that

$$-\delta < \arg y_{\epsilon_k} < \delta \quad \text{as} \quad \epsilon_k \to 0. \tag{2.28}$$

Denote

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^1_{\epsilon_k} =& \Big\{ x \in B_R(0) : \sqrt{|x|^2 + |y_{\epsilon_k}|^2} \leq \frac{A}{\epsilon_k} \Big\} \\ =& \Big\{ x \in B_R(0) : |x|^2 \leq \Big(\frac{A}{\epsilon_k} \Big)^2 - |y_{\epsilon_k}|^2 \Big\}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.29}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^2_{\epsilon_k} =& \Big\{ x \in B_R(0) : \sqrt{|x|^2 + |y_{\epsilon_k}|^2} > \frac{A}{\epsilon_k} \Big\} \\ =& \Big\{ x \in B_R(0) : \Big(\frac{A}{\epsilon_k} \Big)^2 - |y_{\epsilon_k}|^2 < |x|^2 < R^2 \Big\}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.30}$$

so that $B_R(0) = \Omega^1_{\epsilon_k} \cup \Omega^2_{\epsilon_k}$ and $\Omega^1_{\epsilon_k} \cap \Omega^2_{\epsilon_k} = \emptyset$. Since

$$|\Omega^1_{\epsilon_k}| + |\Omega^2_{\epsilon_k}| = |B_R(0)| = \pi R^2,$$

there exists a subsequence, still denoted by $\{\epsilon_k\}$, of $\{\epsilon_k\}$ such that

$$\text{either} \quad |\Omega^1_{\epsilon_k}| \geq \frac{\pi R^2}{2} \quad \text{or} \quad |\Omega^2_{\epsilon_k}| \geq \frac{\pi R^2}{2}.$$

We finish the proof by considering the following two cases:

Case 1: $|\Omega^1_{\epsilon_k}| \geq \frac{\pi R^2}{2}$. In this case, we have $B_{\frac{R}{\sqrt{2}}}(0) \subset \Omega^1_{\epsilon_k}$, and set

$$\Omega_1 := \Big(B_{\frac{R}{\sqrt{2}}}(0) \setminus B_{\frac{R}{2}}(0)\Big) \cap \Big\{x : \frac{\pi}{2} + 2\delta < \arg x < \frac{3\pi}{2} - 2\delta\Big\} \subset \Omega^1_{\epsilon_k}.$$

Then

$$|\Omega_1| = \frac{(\pi - 4\delta)}{8} R^2. \tag{2.31}$$

By (2.28), one can easily check that for any $x \in \Omega_1$,

$$x \cdot y_{\epsilon_k} = |x||y_{\epsilon_k}| \cos\langle x, y_{\epsilon_k}\rangle < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad |\cos\langle x, y_{\epsilon_k}\rangle| > -\cos(\frac{\pi}{2} + \delta) > 0. \tag{2.32}$$

We thus derive from (2.27) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sqrt{|x|^2 + |y_{\epsilon_k}|^2} + \frac{x \cdot y_{\epsilon_k}}{\sqrt{|x|^2 + |y_{\epsilon_k}|^2}} - \frac{A}{\epsilon_k} + O(\frac{1}{|y_{\epsilon_k}|}) \leq \frac{x \cdot y_{\epsilon_k}}{\sqrt{|x|^2 + |y_{\epsilon_k}|^2}} + O(\frac{1}{|y_{\epsilon_k}|}) \\
&\leq \frac{x \cdot y_{\epsilon_k}}{2\sqrt{|x|^2 + |y_{\epsilon_k}|^2}} \leq \frac{|x||y_{\epsilon_k}| \cos(\frac{\pi}{2} + \delta)}{2\sqrt{|x|^2 + |y_{\epsilon_k}|^2}} < 0 \quad \text{for} \quad x \in \Omega_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Noting that $\lim\limits_{\epsilon_k \to 0} |y_{\epsilon_k}| = \infty$, we thus have

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon_k^2} V(\epsilon_k x + \epsilon y_{\epsilon_k}) \geq \frac{\cos^2(\frac{\pi}{2} + \delta)|x|^2}{8} \quad \text{for} \quad x \in \Omega_1. \tag{2.33}$$

Taking $\delta = \frac{\pi}{20}$, the above estimate implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{\epsilon_k \to 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon_k^2} \int_{B_R} V(\epsilon_k x + \epsilon_k y_{\epsilon_k}) |w_a(x)|^2 dx &\geq \lim_{\epsilon_k \to 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon_k^2} \int_{\Omega_1} V(\epsilon_k x + \epsilon_k y_{\epsilon_k}) |w_a(x)|^2 dx \\
&\geq \frac{\cos^2 \frac{11\pi}{20}}{8} \int_{\Omega_1} |x|^2 |w_0(x)|^2 dx := C(R) > 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.34}$$

and then (2.24) is proved.

Case 2: $|\Omega^2_{\epsilon_k}| \geq \frac{\pi R^2}{2}$. In this case, we deduce that the annular region $D_R := B_R \setminus B_{\frac{R}{\sqrt{2}}} \subset \Omega^2_{\epsilon_k}$. Set $\Omega_2 := D_R \cap \big\{x; -\frac{\pi}{2} + 2\delta < \arg x < \frac{\pi}{2} - 2\delta\big\} \subset \Omega^2_{\epsilon_k}$. Then,

$$|\Omega_2| = \frac{(\pi - 4\delta)}{4} R^2. \tag{2.35}$$

One can check that for any $x \in \Omega_2$,

$$x \cdot y_{\epsilon_k} = |x||y_{\epsilon_k}| \cos\langle x, y_{\epsilon_k}\rangle > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \cos\langle x, y_{\epsilon_k}\rangle > \cos(\frac{\pi}{2} - \delta) > 0. \tag{2.36}$$

It then follows from (2.27) and (2.36) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sqrt{|x|^2 + |y_{\epsilon_k}|^2} + \frac{x \cdot y_{\epsilon_k}}{\sqrt{|x|^2 + |y_{\epsilon_k}|^2}} - \frac{A}{\epsilon_k} + O(\frac{1}{|y_{\epsilon_k}|}) \geq \frac{x \cdot y_{\epsilon_k}}{\sqrt{|x|^2 + |y_{\epsilon_k}|^2}} + O(\frac{1}{|y_{\epsilon_k}|}) \\
&\geq \frac{x \cdot y_{\epsilon_k}}{2\sqrt{|x|^2 + |y_{\epsilon_k}|^2}} \geq \frac{|x||y_{\epsilon_k}| \cos(\frac{\pi}{2} - \delta)}{2\sqrt{|x|^2 + |y_{\epsilon_k}|^2}} > 0 \quad \text{for} \quad x \in \Omega_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon_k^2} V(\epsilon_k x + \epsilon_k y_{\epsilon_k}) \geq \frac{\cos^2(\frac{\pi}{2} - \delta)|x|^2}{8} \quad \text{for} \quad x \in \Omega_2.$$

Thus, by taking $\delta = \frac{\pi}{20}$, the above estimate gives that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{\epsilon_k \to 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon_k^2} \int_{B_R} V(\epsilon_k x + \epsilon_k y_{\epsilon_k}) |w_a(x)|^2 dx &\geq \lim_{\epsilon_k \to 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon_k^2} \int_{\Omega_2} V(\epsilon_k x + \epsilon_k y_{\epsilon_k}) |w_a(x)|^2 dx \\
&\geq \frac{\cos^2 \frac{9\pi}{20}}{8} \int_{\Omega_2} |x|^2 |w_0(x)|^2 dx := C_0(R) > 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.37}$$

Therefore, (2.24) also follows from (2.34) and (2.37) in this case. □

We end this section by proving Theorem 1.2, that is, establishing the refined estimates for $e(a)$.

Proof of Theorem 1.2: By Lemma 2.1, it suffices to prove that there exists a positive $C > 0$, independent of a, such that

$$e(a) > C(a^* - a)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{as} \quad a \nearrow a^*. \tag{2.38}$$

Actually, from the proof of Lemma 2.3 (iii), we see that for any sequence $\{a_k\}$ with $a_k \nearrow a^*$, there exists a convergent subsequence, still denoted by $\{a_k\}$, such that $w_{a_k} \to w_0 > 0$ strongly in $L^4(\mathbb{R}^2)$, where w_0 satisfies (2.23). This implies that there exists a constant $M_1 > 0$, independent of a_k, such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |w_{a_k}(x)|^4 dx > M_1 \quad \text{as} \quad a_k \nearrow a^*.$$

Moreover, applying (2.24) with $R = 1$ yields that there exists a constant $M_2 > 0$, independent of a_k, such that

$$\int_{B_1(0)} V(\epsilon_k x + \epsilon_k y_{\epsilon_k}) |w_{a_k}(x)|^2 dx \geq M_2 \epsilon_k^2 \quad \text{as} \quad a_k \nearrow a^*.$$

Thus,

$$
\begin{aligned}
e(a_k) = E_{a_k}(u_{a_k}) &= \frac{1}{\epsilon_k^2}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla w_{a_k}(x)|^2 dx - \frac{a^*}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |w_{a_k}(x)|^4 dx\right] \\
&+ \frac{a^* - a_k}{2\epsilon_k^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |w_{a_k}(x)|^4 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(\epsilon_k x + \epsilon_k y_{\epsilon_k})|w_{a_k}(x)|^2 dx \qquad (2.39) \\
&\geq \frac{a^* - a_k}{2\epsilon_k^2} M_1 + M_2\epsilon_k^2 \geq \sqrt{2M_1M_2}(a^* - a_k)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{as} \quad a_k \nearrow a^*,
\end{aligned}
$$

and (2.38) therefore holds for the subsequence $\{a_k\}$.

We finally claim that (2.38) actually holds for any $a \nearrow a^*$. Otherwise, there exists a sequence $\{a_m\}$ such that $a_m \nearrow a^*$ as $m \to \infty$ and

$$
\lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{e(a_m)}{(a^* - a_m)^{\frac{1}{2}}} = 0\,. \qquad (2.40)
$$

By the proof of Lemma 2.3 (iii), we know that there exists a subsequence, still denoted by $\{a_m\}$, such that $\bar{x}_m := \epsilon_m y_{\epsilon_m} \xrightarrow{m} \bar{x}_0$ with $|\bar{x}_0| = A > 0$ and $w_m(x) := w_{a_m}(x)$ defined in (2.9) satisfies

$$
w_m(x) \xrightarrow{m} \tilde{w_0}(x) > 0 \quad \text{strongly in} \quad H^1(\mathbb{R}^2), \qquad (2.41)
$$

where $\tilde{w_0} > 0$ is a solution of (2.22) for some $\beta_1 > 0$. Moreover, by the same argument of Lemma 2.4, we also have

$$
\lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{1}{\epsilon_m^2}\int_{B_R(0)} V(\epsilon_m x + \epsilon_m y_{\epsilon_m})|w_m(x)|^2 dx \geq C_0(R), \qquad (2.42)
$$

where $C_0(R) > 0$ is independent of m. Applying (2.41) and (2.42), an argument similar to (2.39) yields that there exists some constant $C > 0$, independent of m, so that

$$
e(a_m) \geq C(a^* - a_m)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{as} \quad a_m \nearrow a^*,
$$

which however contradicts (2.40). This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2. □

3 Mass concentration and symmetry breaking

In this section we complete the proof of Theorem 1.3 under the ring-shaped potential $V(x) = (|x| - A)^2$ with $A > 0$, which addresses the mass concentration and symmetry breaking of minimizers as $a \nearrow a^*$. Let u_a be a non-negative minimizer of (1.4). Applying the energy estimates of Theorem 1.2, a proof similar to that of Lemma 4 in [12] yields that there exists a positive constant M, independent of a, such that

$$
0 < M(a^* - a)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_a|^4 dx \leq \frac{1}{M}(a^* - a)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{as} \quad a \nearrow a^*. \qquad (3.1)
$$

Stimulated by above estimates, we define

$$\varepsilon_a := (a^* - a)^{\frac{1}{4}} > 0\,. \tag{3.2}$$

From (1.13) we conclude that

$$e(a) \geq \Big(1 - \frac{a}{a^*}\Big) \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_a(x)|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (|x| - A)^2 u_a^2(x) dx\,,$$

and it hence follows from Theorem 1.2 that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_a(x)|^2 dx \leq C\varepsilon_a^{-2} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (|x| - A)^2 u_a^2(x) dx \leq C\varepsilon_a^2. \tag{3.3}$$

Similar to Lemma 2.3 (ii), for ε_a given by (3.2), we know that there exist a sequence $\{y_{\varepsilon_a}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and positive constants R_0 and η such that

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon_a \searrow 0} \int_{B_{R_0}(0)} |w_a|^2 dx \geq \eta > 0, \tag{3.4}$$

where we define the $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$-normalized function

$$w_a(x) = \varepsilon_a u_a(\varepsilon_a x + \varepsilon_a y_{\varepsilon_a}). \tag{3.5}$$

Note from (3.1) and (3.3) that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla w_a|^2 dx < C, \quad M \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |w_a|^4 dx \leq \frac{1}{M}, \tag{3.6}$$

where the positive constants C and M are independent of a.

Lemma 3.1. *For any given sequence $\{a_k\}$ with $a_k \nearrow a^*$, let $\varepsilon_k := \varepsilon_{a_k} = (a^* - a_k)^{\frac{1}{4}} > 0$, $u_k(x) := u_{a_k}(x)$ be a non-negative minimizer of (1.4), and $w_k := w_{a_k} \geq 0$ be defined by (3.5). Then, there is a subsequence, still denoted by $\{a_k\}$, such that*

$$z_k := \varepsilon_k y_{\varepsilon_k} \xrightarrow{k} y_0 \text{ for some } y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ and } |y_0| = A\ . \tag{3.7}$$

Moreover, for any $\delta > 0$ small enough, we have

$$u_k(x) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_k} w_k\Big(\frac{x - z_k}{\varepsilon_k}\Big) \xrightarrow{k} 0,\ \forall\ x \in B_\delta^c(y_0). \tag{3.8}$$

Proof. By (2.20) and (3.5), we see that w_k satisfies

$$-\Delta w_k(x) + \varepsilon_k^2(|\varepsilon_k x + \varepsilon_k y_{\varepsilon_k}| - A)^2 w_k(x) = \mu_k \varepsilon_k^2 w_k(x) + a_k w_k^3(x) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2, \tag{3.9}$$

where $\mu_k \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is a Lagrange multiplier. Similarly to the proof of Lemma 2.3 (iii), we can prove that there exists a subsequence of $\{w_k\}$, still denoted by $\{w_k\}$, such that (3.7) holds and $w_k \xrightarrow{k} w_0$ strongly in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for some positive function w_0 satisfying

$$-\Delta w_0(x) = -\beta^2 w_0(x) + a^* w_0^3(x) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2, \tag{3.10}$$

where $\beta > 0$ is a positive constant. Hence, for an arbitrary large number $\alpha > 2$,

$$\int_{|x|\geq R} |w_k|^\alpha dx \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad R \to \infty \quad \text{uniformly for large } k. \tag{3.11}$$

Note from (3.9) that $-\Delta w_k - c(x)w_k \leq 0$, where $c(x) = a_k w_k^2(x)$. By applying De Giorgi-Nash-Moser theory, we thus have

$$\max_{B_1(\xi)} w_k \leq C\Big(\int_{B_2(\xi)} |w_k|^\alpha dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}},$$

where ξ is an arbitrary point in $\mathbb{R}^2$, and C is a constant depending only on the bound of $\|w_k\|_{L^\alpha(B_2(\xi))}$. We hence deduce from (3.11) that

$$w_k(x) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad |x| \to \infty \quad \text{uniformly in } k. \tag{3.12}$$

Since w_k satisfies (3.9), one can use the comparison principle as in [16] to compare w_k with $Ce^{-\frac{\beta}{2}|x|}$, which then shows that there exists a large constant $R > 0$, independent of k, such that

$$w_k(x) \leq Ce^{-\frac{\beta}{2}|x|} \quad \text{for} \quad |x| > R \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty. \tag{3.13}$$

For any $x \in B_\delta^c(y_0)$, it then follows from (3.7) that

$$\frac{|x - z_k|}{\varepsilon_k} \geq \frac{1}{2}\frac{|x - y_0|}{\varepsilon_k} \geq \frac{\delta}{2\varepsilon_k} \overset{k}{\to} +\infty,$$

which, together with (3.13), yields that

$$u_k(x) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_k} w_k\Big(\frac{x - z_k}{\varepsilon_k}\Big) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon_k} e^{-\frac{\beta\delta}{2\varepsilon_k}} \overset{k}{\to} 0, \ \forall\ x \in B_\delta^c(y_0),$$

i.e., (3.8) holds. □

Motivated by [12, 32], we are now ready to prove Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We still set $\varepsilon_k = (a^* - a_k)^{\frac{1}{4}} > 0$, where $a_k \nearrow a^*$, and $u_k(x) := u_{a_k}(x)$ is a non-negative minimizer of (1.4). We start the proof by establishing first the detailed concentration behavior of u_k.

Let $\bar{z}_k$ be any local maximum point of u_k. It then follows from (3.9) that

$$u_k(\bar{z}_k) \geq \Big(\frac{-\mu_k}{a_k}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq C\varepsilon_k^{-1}. \tag{3.14}$$

This estimate and (3.8) imply that, by passing to subsequence,

$$\bar{z}_k \overset{k}{\to} y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ with } |y_0| = A. \tag{3.15}$$

Set

$$\bar{w}_k = \varepsilon_k u_k(\varepsilon_k x + \bar{z}_k). \tag{3.16}$$

It then follows from (3.9) that

$$-\Delta\bar{w}_k(x)+\varepsilon_k^2(|\varepsilon_k x+\bar{z}_k|-A)^2\bar{w}_k(x)=\mu_k\varepsilon_k^2\bar{w}_k(x)+a_k\bar{w}_k^3(x)\ \text{ in }\ \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{3.17}$$

We claim that $\bar{w}_k$ satisfies (3.4) for some positive constants R_0 and η. To prove this claim, we first show that $\{\frac{\bar{z}_k-z_k}{\varepsilon_k}\}$ is bounded in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Otherwise, if $\left|\frac{\bar{z}_k-z_k}{\varepsilon_k}\right|\to\infty$ as $k\to\infty$, it then follows from the exponential decay (3.13) that

$$u_k(\bar{z}_k)=\frac{1}{\varepsilon_k}w_k(\frac{\bar{z}_k-z_k}{\varepsilon_k})\le\frac{C}{\varepsilon_k}e^{-\frac{\beta}{2}\left|\frac{\bar{z}_k-z_k}{\varepsilon_k}\right|}=o(\varepsilon_k^{-1})\quad\text{as}\quad k\to\infty\,,$$

which however contradicts (3.14). Therefore, there exists a constant $R_1>0$, independent of k, such that $\left|\frac{\bar{z}_k-z_k}{\varepsilon_k}\right|<\frac{R_1}{2}$. Note from (3.16) and (3.5) that

$$\bar{w}_k(x)=w_k(x+\frac{\bar{z}_k-z_k}{\varepsilon_k})\,.$$

Since w_k satisfies (3.4), we then obtain from the above that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{B_{R_0+R_1}(0)}|\bar{w}_k|^2dx=\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{B_{R_0+R_1}(\frac{\bar{z}_k-z_k}{\varepsilon_k})}|w_k|^2dx\ge\int_{B_{R_0}(0)}|w_k|^2dx\ge\eta>0\,, \tag{3.18}$$

and the claim is therefore established.

As in the proof of Lemma 3.1 (see also Lemma 2.3 (iii)), one can further derive that there exists a subsequence, still denoted by $\{\bar{w}_k\}$, of $\{\bar{w}_k\}$ such that

$$\bar{w}_k\xrightarrow{k}\bar{w}_0\ \text{strongly in}\ H^1(\mathbb{R}^2), \tag{3.19}$$

for some nonnegative function $\bar{w}_0\ge0$, where $\bar{w}_0$ satisfies (3.10) for some constant $\beta>0$. Note from (3.18) that $\bar{w}_0\not\equiv0$. Thus, the strong maximum principle yields that $\bar{w}_0(x)>0$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Since the origin is a critical point of $\bar{w}_k$ for all $k>0$, it is also a critical point of $\bar{w}_0$. We therefore conclude from the uniqueness (up to translations) of positive radial solutions for (1.6) that $\bar{w}_0$ is spherically symmetric about the origin, and

$$\bar{w}_0=\frac{\beta}{\|Q\|_2}Q(\beta|x|)\quad\text{for}\quad\text{some}\quad\beta>0. \tag{3.20}$$

One can deduce from the above that $\bar{w}_k\ge(\frac{\beta^2}{2a^*})^{\frac{1}{2}}$ at each local maximum point. Since $\bar{w}_k$ decays to zero uniformly in k as $|x|\to\infty$, all local maximum points of $\bar{w}_k$ stay in a finite ball in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Since $\bar{w}_k\to\bar{w}_0$ in $C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and the origin is the only critical point of $\bar{w}_0$, all local maximum points must approach the origin and hence stay in a small ball $B_\epsilon(0)$ as $k\to\infty$. One can take ϵ small enough such that $\bar{w}_0''(r)<0$ for $0\le r\le\epsilon$. It then follows from Lemma 4.2 in [26] that for large k, $\bar{w}_k$ has no critical points other than the origin. This gives the uniqueness of local maximum points for $\bar{w}_k(x)$, which therefore implies that there exists a subsequence of u_k concentrating at a *unique* global minimum

point of potential $V(x) = (|x| - A)^2$.

To complete the proof of Theorem 1.3, we need to compute the exact value of β defined in (3.20). From (3.16), we have

$$e(a_k) = E_{a_k}(u_k) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_k^2}\Big[\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \bar{w}_k(x)|^2 dx - \frac{a^*}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \bar{w}_k^4(x)dx\Big] + \frac{\varepsilon_k^2}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \bar{w}_k^4(x)dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \big(|\varepsilon_k x + \bar{z}_k| - |y_0|\big)^2 \bar{w}_k^2(x)dx\,, \tag{3.21}$$

where $\bar{z}_k$ is the unique global maximum point of u_k, and $\bar{z}_k \to y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ as $k \to \infty$ for some $|y_0| = A > 0$. The term in square brackets is non-negative and can be dropped for the lower bound of $e(a_k)$. The $L^4(\mathbb{R}^2)$ norm of $\bar{w}_k$ converges to that of $\bar{w}_0$ as $k \to \infty$.

To estimate the last term of (3.21), we claim that $\big\{\frac{|\bar{z}_k| - |y_0|}{\varepsilon_k}\big\}$ is bounded uniformly for $k \to \infty$. Indeed, if there exists a subsequence of $\{a_k\}$, still denoted by $\{a_k\}$, such that $\big|\frac{|\bar{z}_k| - |y_0|}{\varepsilon_k}\big| \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$, then for an arbitrary constant $C > 0$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \varepsilon_k^{-2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \big(|\varepsilon_k x + \bar{z}_k| - |y_0|\big)^2 \bar{w}_k^2(x)dx = \lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Big(|x + \frac{\bar{z}_k}{\varepsilon_k}| - \frac{|y_0|}{\varepsilon_k}\Big)^2 \bar{w}_k^2(x)dx \ge C\,.$$

This estimate and (3.21) then imply that

$$e(a_k) \ge C\varepsilon_k^2 = C(a^* - a_k)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

holds for arbitrary constant $C > 0$, which however contradicts Theorem 1.2, and the claim is therefore true.

We now deduce from the above claim that there exists a subsequence still denoted by $\{a_k\}$ such that

$$\frac{|\bar{z}_k| - |y_0|}{\varepsilon_k} \to C_0 \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty \tag{3.22}$$

for some constant C_0. Since Q is a radial decreasing function and decays exponentially as $|x| \to \infty$, we then deduce from (3.20) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{\varepsilon_k^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \big(|\varepsilon_k x + \bar{z}_k| - |y_0|\big)^2 \bar{w}_k^2(x)dx \\
&= \lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Big(\frac{|\varepsilon_k x + \bar{z}_k|}{\varepsilon_k} - \frac{|y_0|}{\varepsilon_k}\Big)^2 \bar{w}_k^2(x)dx \\
&= \lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Big(\frac{|\varepsilon_k x + \bar{z}_k| - |\bar{z}_k|}{\varepsilon_k} + \frac{|\bar{z}_k| - |y_0|}{\varepsilon_k}\Big)^2 \bar{w}_k^2(x)dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Big(\frac{y_0 \cdot x}{|y_0|} + C_0\Big)^2 \bar{w}_0^2(x)dx \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{|y_0 \cdot x|^2}{A^2}\bar{w}_0^2(x)dx\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

where the equality holds if and only if $C_0 = 0$. We hence infer from (3.21) and (3.23) that

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{e(a_k)}{(a^*-a_k)^{1/2}} &\geq \frac{1}{2}\|\bar{w}_0\|_4^4 + \frac{1}{A^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}|y_0\cdot x|^2\bar{w}_0^2(x)dx \\ &= \frac{1}{a^*}\Big(\beta^2 + \frac{1}{A^2\beta^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}|y_0\cdot x|^2Q^2(x)dx\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

where (1.14) is used in the equality. Thus, taking the infimum over $\beta > 0$ yields that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{e(a_k)}{(a^*-a_k)^{1/2}} \geq \frac{2}{a^*}\Big(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}|y_0\cdot x|^2Q^2(x)dx}{A^2}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{3.25}$$

where the equality is achieved at

$$\beta = \lambda_0 := \Big(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}|y_0\cdot x|^2Q^2(x)dx}{A^2}\Big)^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

We finally note that the limit in (3.25) actually exists, and it is equal to the right hand side of (3.25). To see this, one simply takes

$$u(x) = \frac{\beta}{\varepsilon\|Q\|_2}Q\Big(\frac{\beta|x-y_0|}{\varepsilon}\Big)$$

as a trial function for $E_a(\cdot)$ and minimizes over $\beta > 0$. The result is that

$$\lim_{a_k\nearrow a^*}\frac{e(a_k)}{(a^*-a_k)^{1/2}} = \frac{2}{a^*}\Big(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}|y_0\cdot x|^2Q^2(x)dx}{A^2}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{3.26}$$

The equality (3.26) gives us two conclusions. Firstly, β is unique, which is independent of the choice of the subsequence, and equal to the expression minimizing (3.24), i.e., $\beta = \lambda_0$. Secondly, (3.23) is indeed an equality, and thus $C_0 = 0$, i.e., (1.10) holds. Moreover, from (3.15), (3.19) and (3.20), we see that

$$\bar{w}_k(x) = \varepsilon_k u(\varepsilon_k x + \bar{z}_k) \overset{k}{\to} \frac{\lambda_0}{\|Q\|_2}Q(\lambda_0|x|) \text{ strongly in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^2),$$

where $\bar{z}_k$ is the unique maximum point of u_k and $\bar{z}_k \overset{k}{\to} y_0$ for some $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ satisfying $|y_0| = A > 0$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.3. □

Theorem 1.3 gives a detailed description on the concentration behavior of the minimizers of $e(a)$ when a is close to a^*, upon which the phenomena of symmetry breaking of the the minimizers of $e(a)$ can be demonstrated in Corollary 1.4 which we are going to prove now. With these conclusions we see that, when a increases from 0 to a^*, the minimizers of GP energy $e(a)$ have essentially different properties. The GP energy $e(a)$ has a unique non-negative minimizer which is radially symmetric if $a > 0$ is small, but $e(a)$ has infinity many minimizers which are non-radially symmetric if a approaches a^*.

Proof of Corollary 1.4. (i): By the proof of Theorem 1.1(ii) in the Appendix, we know that there exists a positive constant a_{**} such that $e(a)$ has a unique non-negative minimizer for each $a \in [0, a_{**})$. Moreover, it is not difficult to see that this unique minimizer must be radially symmetric since $V(x)$ given by (1.7) is radially symmetric and any rotation of the minimizer is still a minimizer of $e(a)$.

(ii): It follows from Theorem 1.3 that there exists $a_* > 0$ such that, for $a \in (a_*, a^*)$, any non-negative minimizer of $e(a)$ has a unique maximum point x_a, and $\{x_a\}_a$ tends to a point on the circular bottom of $V(x)$: $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x| = A\}$ as $a \nearrow a^*$. That is, when $a \in (a_*, a^*)$ each minimizer of $e(a)$ concentrates around a point on the circular bottom of $V(x)$, which then implies that all minimizers of $e(a)$ cannot be radially symmetric for $a \in (a_*, a^*)$. Moreover, since $V(x)$ is radially symmetric, by rotation we can find that there are infinitely many minimizers of $e(a)$ for any $a \in (a_*, a^*)$. □

4 Appendix: Proof of Theorem 1.1(ii)

In this appendix, we always assume that

$$0 \le V(x) \in L^\infty_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^2)\,, \quad \lim_{|x|\to\infty} V(x) = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{x\in\mathbb{R}^2} V(x) = 0\,. \tag{4.1}$$

The properties of the Schrödinger operator $-\Delta + V(x)$ with $V(x) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ are well known, see e.g. [31], but we could not find a reference for that of $V(x)$ satisfying (4.1) although we guess it should exist somewhere. For the sake of completeness, we begin this appendix by giving some properties of the Schrödinger operator $-\Delta + V(x)$ under conditions (4.1), which are required in proving the uniqueness of non-negative minimizers. Before going to the properties of $-\Delta + V(x)$, we recall the following embedding lemma, which can be found in [28, Theorem XIII.67], [7, Lemma 2.1] or [2, Lemma 2.1], etc.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose $V(x)$ satisfies (4.1). Then, the embedding $\mathcal{H} \hookrightarrow L^q(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is compact for all $q \in [2, \infty)$.*

□

Define

$$\mu_1 = \inf\Big\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u|^2 + V(x)u^2 dx : \ u \in \mathcal{H} \text{ and } \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u^2 dx = 1\Big\}\,. \tag{4.2}$$

Usually, μ_1 is called the first eigenvalue of $-\Delta + V(x)$ in $\mathcal{H}$. Moreover, by Lemma 4.1, it is not difficult to know that μ_1 is simple and can be attained by a positive function $\phi_1 \in \mathcal{H}$. $\phi_1 > 0$ is then called the first eigenfunction of $-\Delta + V(x)$ in $\mathcal{H}$. We now define

$$\mu_2 = \inf\Big\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u|^2 + V(x)u^2 dx : u \in Z \text{ and } \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u^2 dx = 1\Big\}\,, \tag{4.3}$$

where

$$Z = \text{span}\{\phi_1\}^\perp = \Big\{u : u \in \mathcal{H}, \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u\phi_1 dx = 0\Big\}\,.$$

It is known that $\mu_2 > \mu_1$ and

$$\mathcal{H} = \text{span}\{\phi_1\} \oplus Z\,. \tag{4.4}$$

Then, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *Under the assumption of (4.1), we have*

(i) $ker\big(-\Delta+V(x)-\mu_1\big)=span\{\phi_1\}$;

(ii) $\phi_1\notin\big(-\Delta+V(x)-\mu_1\big)Z$;

(iii) $Im\ \big(-\Delta+V(x)-\mu_1\big)=\big(-\Delta+V(x)-\mu_1\big)Z$ *is closed in* $\mathcal{H}^*$;

(iv) $codim\ Im\ \big(-\Delta+V(x)-\mu_1\big)=1$.

where $\mathcal{H}^*$ *denotes the dual space of* $\mathcal{H}$.

proof: Since the proofs of (i) and (ii) are standard, we only prove (iii) and (iv).

(iii): For any $z\in Z$, and $\psi\in\mathcal{H}$, we obtain from (4.2) and (4.3) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big|\big\langle(-\Delta+V(x)-\mu_1)z,\psi\big\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^*,\mathcal{H}}\Big|=\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\nabla z\nabla\psi+V(x)z\psi dx-\mu_1\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}z\psi dx\Big|\\&\le\|z\|_{\mathcal{H}}\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}}+\mu_1\|z\|_2\|\psi\|_2\le(1+\sqrt{\frac{\mu_1}{\mu_2}})\|z\|_{\mathcal{H}}\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{H}}\,.\end{aligned}\tag{4.5}$$

On the other hand, it follows from (4.2) that

$$\begin{aligned}\big\langle(-\Delta+V(x)-\mu_1)z,z\big\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^*,\mathcal{H}}&=\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}|\nabla z|^2+V(x)z^2dx-\mu_1\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}z^2dx\\&\ge\big(1-\frac{\mu_1}{\mu_2}\big)\|z\|^2_{\mathcal{H}}\,.\end{aligned}\tag{4.6}$$

It then follows from (4.5) and (4.6) that

$$\big(1-\frac{\mu_1}{\mu_2}\big)\|z\|_{\mathcal{H}}\le\|(-\Delta+V(x)-\mu_1)z\|_{\mathcal{H}^*}\le(1+\sqrt{\frac{\mu_1}{\mu_2}})\|z\|_{\mathcal{H}}\quad\text{for all}\quad z\in Z,$$

which proves (iii).

(iv): For any $f\in\mathcal{H}^*$, by Riesz representation theorem, there exists $u\in\mathcal{H}$ such that

$$f(\psi)=\langle u,\psi\rangle_{\mathcal{H},\mathcal{H}}\quad\text{for all}\quad\psi\in\mathcal{H}\,,$$

i.e.,

$$f=\big(-\Delta+V(x)\big)u\,.$$

In view of (4.4), we can write $u=c\phi_1+z_1$ for some $z_1\in Z$. Thus,

$$f=\big(-\Delta+V(x)\big)u=c\mu_1\phi_1+\big(-\Delta+V(x)\big)z_1\quad\text{in}\quad\mathcal{H}^*\,.\tag{4.7}$$

Note from (4.5) and (4.6) that $\big\langle(-\Delta+V(x)-\mu_1)\cdot,\cdot\big\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^*,\mathcal{H}}$ is an inner product on Z, and $\big(-\Delta+V(x)\big)z_1\in Z^*$, where Z^* denotes the dual space of Z. Hence, by applying Riesz representation theorem again, there exists $z_2\in Z$ such that

$$\big\langle(-\Delta+V(x))z_1,z\big\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^*,\mathcal{H}}=\big\langle(-\Delta+V(x)-\mu_1)z_2,z\big\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^*,\mathcal{H}}\quad\text{for all}\quad z\in Z\,.\tag{4.8}$$

Moreover, since

$$\begin{aligned}&\big\langle(-\Delta+V(x))z_1,\phi_1\big\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^*,\mathcal{H}}=\big\langle z_1,(-\Delta+V(x))\phi_1\big\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^*,\mathcal{H}}=\mu_1\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}z_1\phi_1=0\,,\\&\big\langle(-\Delta+V(x)-\mu_1)z_2,\phi_1\big\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^*,\mathcal{H}}=\big\langle z_2,(-\Delta+V(x)-\mu_1)\phi_1\big\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^*,\mathcal{H}}=0,\end{aligned}$$

We obtain from (4.8) that

$$\big\langle(-\Delta+V(x))z_1,\psi\big\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^*,\mathcal{H}}=\big\langle(-\Delta+V(x)-\mu_1)z_2,\psi\big\rangle_{\mathcal{H}^*,\mathcal{H}}\quad\text{for all}\quad\psi\in\mathcal{H}\,,$$

equivalently,

$$\big(-\Delta+V(x)\big)z_1=\big(-\Delta+V(x)-\mu_1\big)z_2\quad\text{in}\quad\mathcal{H}^*\quad\text{for some}\quad z_2\in Z\,.$$

It then follows from (4.7) that

$$f=\big(-\Delta+V(x)\big)u=c\mu_1\phi_1+\big(-\Delta+V(x)-\mu_1\big)z_2\quad\text{in}\quad\mathcal{H}^*\,.$$

Then, by (ii), we have

$$\mathcal{H}^*=\text{span}\{\phi_1\}\oplus(-\Delta+V(x)-\mu_1)Z,$$

which implies (iv). □

Stimulated by Theorem 3.2 in [5], we have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.3. *Define the following C^1 functional $F:\mathcal{H}\times\mathbb{R}^2\mapsto\mathcal{H}^*$*

$$F(u,\mu,a)=\big(-\Delta+V(x)-\mu\big)u-au^3\,.\tag{4.9}$$

Then, there exist $\delta>0$ and a unique function $\big(u(a),\mu(a)\big)\in C^1\big(B_\delta(0);B_\delta(\mu_1,\phi_1)\big)$ such that

$$\begin{cases}\mu(0)=\mu_1,\quad u(0)=\phi_1;\\ F\big(u(a),\mu(a),a\big)=0;\\ \|u(a)\|_2^2=1\,.\end{cases}\tag{4.10}$$

Proof. Let $g:Z\times\mathbb{R}^3\mapsto\mathcal{H}^*$ be defined by

$$g(z,\tau,s,a):=F\big((1+s)\phi_1+z,\mu_1+\tau,a\big)\,.$$

Then $g\in C^1(Z\times\mathbb{R}^3,\mathcal{H}^*)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}&g(0,0,0,0)=F(\phi_1,\mu_1,0)=0\,,\\ &g_s(0,0,0,0)=F_u(\phi_1,\mu_1,0)\phi_1=\big(-\Delta+V(x)-\mu_1\big)\phi_1=0\,.\end{aligned}\tag{4.11}$$

Moreover, for any $(\hat z,\hat\tau)\in Z\times\mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}g_{(z,\tau)}(0,0,0,0)(\hat z,\hat\tau)&=F_u(\phi_1,\mu_1,0)\hat z+F_\mu(\phi_1,\mu_1,0)\hat\tau\\&=\big(-\Delta+V(x)-\mu_1\big)\hat z-\hat\tau\phi_1\,.\end{aligned}\tag{4.12}$$

Then, by Lemma 4.2, $g_{(z,\tau)}(0,0,0,0):Z\times\mathbb{R}\mapsto\mathcal{H}^*$ is an isomorphism. Therefore, it follows from the implicit function theorem that there exist $\delta_1>0$ and a unique function $(z(s,a),\tau(s,a))\in C^1(B_{\delta_1}(0,0);B_{\delta_1}(0,0))$ such that

$$\begin{cases}g(z(s,a),\tau(s,a),s,a)=F((1+s)\phi_1+z(s,a),\quad\mu_1+\tau(s,a),a)=0\,,\\ z(0,0)=0,\tau(0,0)=0\,,\\ z_s(0,0)=-g^{-1}_{(z,\tau)}(0,0,0,0)\cdot g_s(0,0,0,0)=0\,.\end{cases}\tag{4.13}$$

Now, let

$$u(s,a) = (1+s)\phi_1 + z(s,a)\,, \quad (s,a) \in B_{\delta_1}(0,0)\,,$$

and define

$$f(s,a) = \|u(s,a)\|_2^2 = (1+s)^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} z(s,a)^2 dx\,, \quad (s,a) \in B_{\delta_1}(0,0)\,.$$

By (4.13), we have

$$f(0,0) = 1, \quad f_s(0,0) = 2 + 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} z_s(0,0)z(0,0)dx = 2\,.$$

Then, by applying implicit function theorem again, there exist $0 < \delta < \delta_1$ and a unique function $s = s(a) \in C^1\big(B_\delta(0); B_\delta(0)\big)$ such that

$$f(s(a),a) = \|u(s(a),a)\|_2^2 = f(0,0) = 1\,, \quad a \in B_\delta(0)\,.$$

This and (4.13) imply that for $a \in B_\delta(0)$, there exists a unique function:

$$\Big(u(a) := u\big(s(a),a\big), \mu(a) := \mu_1 + \tau\big(s(a),a\big)\Big) \in C^1\big(B_\delta(0); B_\delta(\phi_1,\mu_1)\big)$$

such that (4.10) holds, and the proof is therefore complete. □

We are now ready to prove the uniqueness of non-negative minimizers of (1.4), that is, Theorem 1.1 (ii).

Proof of Theorem 1.1 (ii): Let $u_a(x) > 0$ be a non-negative minimizer of $e(a)$ with $a \in [0, a^*)$. It is easy to see that

$$e(0) = \mu_1 \quad \text{and} \quad e(a) \le e(0) = \mu_1\,, \tag{4.14}$$

where μ_1 is the first eigenvalue of $-\Delta + V(x)$. We first prove that

$$e(a) \in C([0,a^*), \mathbb{R}^+)\,. \tag{4.15}$$

Indeed, for any $a_0 \in [0, a^*)$, it follows from Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality (1.13) that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u_a^4 dx \le \frac{2e(a)}{a^* - a} \le \frac{2\mu_1}{a^* - a} \le \frac{4\mu_1}{a^* - a_0} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \le a \le \frac{a^* + a_0}{2}\,. \tag{4.16}$$

Thus,

$$e(a_0) \le E_{a_0}(u_a) = E_a(u_a) + \frac{a - a_0}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u_a^4 dx = e(a) + O(|a - a_0|) \quad \text{as} \quad a \to a_0\,,$$

$$e(a_0) = E_{a_0}(u_{a_0}) = E_a(u_{a_0}) + \frac{a - a_0}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u_{a_0}^4 dx \ge e(a) + O(|a - a_0|) \quad \text{as} \quad a \to a_0\,.$$

Hence,

$$\lim_{a \to a_0} e(a) = e(a_0)\,,$$

which implies (4.15).

Since u_a is a minimizer of (1.4), it satisfies the Euler-Lagrange equation

$$-\Delta u_a(x) + V(x)u_a(x) - \mu_a u_a(x) - a u_a^3(x) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2,$$

where $\mu_a \in \mathbb{R}$ is a suitable Lagrange multiplier, i.e.,

$$F(u_a, \mu_a, a) = 0, \quad \text{where } F(\cdot) \text{ is defined by (4.9).} \tag{4.17}$$

Since

$$\mu_a = e(a) - \frac{a}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_a|^4 dx,$$

it then follows from (4.14)-(4.16) that there exists $a_1 > 0$ small such that

$$|\mu_a - \mu_1| \le |e(a) - \mu_1| + \frac{a}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_a|^4 dx \le \delta \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \le a < a_1\,, \tag{4.18}$$

where $\delta > 0$ is as in Lemma 4.3. On the other hand, since

$$E_0(u_a) = e(a) + \frac{a}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_a|^4 dx \to e(0) = \mu_1 \quad \text{as} \quad a \searrow 0\,,$$

i.e., $\{u_a \ge 0\}$ is a minimizing sequence of $e(0) = \mu_1$ as $a \searrow 0$. Noting that μ_1 is a simple eigenvalue, we can easily deduce from Lemma 4.1 that

$$u_a \to \phi_1 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathcal{H} \quad \text{for all} \quad a \searrow 0\,.$$

This implies that there exists $a_2 > 0$ such that

$$\|u_a - \phi_1\|_{\mathcal{H}} < \delta \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \le a < a_2\,. \tag{4.19}$$

Then using (4.17)-(4.19) and Lemma 4.3, we obtain that

$$\mu_a = \mu(a); \quad u_a = u(a) \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \le a < \min\{a_1, a_2\}\,,$$

i.e., $e(a)$ has a unique non-negative minimizer $u(a)$ if $a > 0$ is small. □

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank Professor Robert Seiringer for his fruitful discussions. Thanks also go to Professor Charles Stuart for helping us to prepare the final version of the paper. This research was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (11322104, 11171339, 11271360) and National Center for Mathematics and Interdisciplinary Sciences.

References

[1] M. H. Anderson, J. R. Ensher, M. R. Matthews, C. E. Wieman and E. A. Cornell, Observation of Bose-Einstein condensation in a dilute atomic vapor, Science **269**, 198–201 (1995).

[2] W. Z. Bao and Y. Y. Cai, Mathematical theory and numerical methods for Bose-Einstein condensation, Kinetic and Related Models **6**, 1–135 (2013).

[3] T. Cazenave, *Semilinear Schrödinger Equations*, Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics **10**, Courant Institute of Mathematical Science/AMS, New York (2003).

[4] D. I. Choi and Q. Niu, Bose Einstein condensation in an optical lattice, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 2022–2025 (1999).

[5] M. G. Crandall and P. H. Rabinowitz, Bifurcation, pertubation of simple eigenvalues and linearized stability, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **52**, 161–180 (1973).

[6] F. Dalfovo, S. Giorgini, L. P. Pitaevskii and S. Stringari, Theory of Bose-Einstein condensation in trapped gases, Rev. Mod. Phys. **71**, 463–512 (1999).

[7] Y. H. Ding and S. J. Li, Homoclinic orbits for first order Hamiltonian systems, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **189**, 585–601 (1995).

[8] L. Erdős, B. Schlein and H. T. Yau, Derivation of the Gross-Pitaevskii equation for the dynamics of Bose-Einstein condensate, Ann. of Math. **172**, 291–370 (2010).

[9] B. Gidas, W. M. Ni and L. Nirenberg, Symmetry of positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations in $\mathbb{R}^n$, Mathematical analysis and applications Part A, Adv. in Math. Suppl. Stud. vol. **7**, Academic Press, New York, 369–402 (1981).

[10] E. P. Gross, Structure of a quantized vortex in boson systems, IL Nuovo Cimento **20**, 454–466 (1961).

[11] E. P. Gross, Hydrodynamics of a superfluid condensate, J. Math. Phys. **4**, 195–207 (1963).

[12] Y. J. Guo and R. Seiringer, On the mass concentration for Bose-Einstein condensates with attractive interactions, Lett. Math. Phys. **104**, 141–156 (2014).

[13] S. Gupta, K. W. Murch, K. L. Moore, T. P. Purdy and D. M. Stamper-Kurn, Bose-Einstein condensation in a circular waveguide, Phy. Rev. Lett. **95**, 143201 (2005).

[14] P. L. Halkyard, *Dynamics in Cold Atomic Gases: Resonant Behaviour of the Quantum Delta-Kicked Accelerator and Bose-Einstein Condensates in Ring Traps*, Ph.D Thesis, Durham University, (2010).

[15] P. L. Halkyard, M. P. A. Jones, and S. A. Gardiner Rotational response of two-component Bose-Einstein condensates in ring traps, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 061602 (R) (2010).

[16] O. Kavian and F. B. Weissler, Self-similar solutions of the pseudo-conformally invariant nonlinear Schrödinger equation, Michigan Math. J. **41(1)**, 151–173 (1994).

[17] M. K. Kwong, Uniqueness of positive solutions of $\Delta u - u + u^p = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **105**, 243–266 (1989).

[18] Y. Li and W. M. Ni, Radial symmetry of positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations in $\mathbb{R}^n$, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **18**, 1043–1054 (1993).

[19] E. H. Lieb and M. Loss, *Analysis*, 2nd edition. Graduate Studies in Mathematics **14**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, second edition (2001).

[20] E. H. Lieb and R. Seiringer, Proof of Bose-Einstein condensation for dilute trapped gases, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 170409-1–4 (2002).

[21] E. H. Lieb, R. Seiringer, J. P. Solovej and J. Yngvason, *The Mathematics of the Bose Gas and its Condensation*, Oberwolfach Seminars **34**, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel (2005).

[22] E. H. Lieb, R. Seiringer and J. Yngvason, Bosons in a trap: A rigorous derivation of the Gross-Pitaevskii energy functional, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 043602-1–13 (2000).

[23] E. H. Lieb, R. Seiringer and J. Yngvason, A rigorous derivation of the Gross-Pitaevskii energy functional for a two-dimensional Bose gas, Comm. Math. Phys. **224**, 17–31 (2001).

[24] P. L. Lions, The concentration-compactness principle in the caclulus of variations. The locally compact case II, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **1**, 223–283 (1984).

[25] K. McLeod and J. Serrin, Uniqueness of positive radial solutions of $\Delta u + f(u) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **99**, 115–145 (1987).

[26] W.-M. Ni and I. Takagi, On the shape of least-energy solutions to a semilinear Neumann problem, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **44**, 819–851 (1991).

[27] L. P. Pitaevskii, Vortex lines in an imperfect Bose gas, Sov. Phys. JETP. **13**, 451–454 (1961).

[28] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics. IV. Analysis of operators*, Academic Press, New York-London, (1978).

[29] C. Ryu, M. F. Andersen, P. Cladé, Vasant Natarajan, K. Helmerson and W. D. Phillips, Observation of persistent flow of a Bose-Einstein condensate in a toroidal trap, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 260401 (2007).

[30] J. Smyrnakis, S. Bargi, G. M. Kavoulakis, M. Magiropoulos, K. Karkkainen and S. M. Reimann, Mixtures of Bose Gases confined in a ring potential, Phy. Rev. Lett. **103**, 100404 (2009).

[31] C. A. Stuart, An introduction to elliptic equations on $\mathbb{R}^N$, *Nonlinear Functional Analysis and Applications to Differential Equations* (ed. A. Ambrosetti, K.-C. Chang and I. Ekeland; World Scientific, Singapore, 1998).

[32] X. F. Wang, On concentration of positive bound states of nonlinear Schrödinger equations, Comm. Math. Phys. **153**, 229–244 (1993).

[33] M. I. Weinstein, Nonlinear Schrödinger equations and sharp interpolations estimates, Comm. Math. Phys. **87**, 567–576 (1983).

Wuhan Institute of Physics and Mathematics,
Chinese Academy of Sciences,
P.O. Box 71010, Wuhan 430071,
P. R. China
email: yjguo@wipm.ac.cn
email: zeng6656078@126.com
email: hszhou@wipm.ac.cn